REMARKS

Claim 26 has been amended to make it clear that the tooling and the second component to which it is affixed have different coefficients of thermal expansion. Support for this is found at page 9 lines 2 - 3.

The present invention can best be understood by reference to Figures 6 and 7. By use of a combination of the expansion compensating tool, and the application of a vacuum bag and autoclave, the expansion of the subcomponents and the compensating tool is kept constant between the three entities even though they have different coefficients of thermal expansion.. Maintenance of this constancy is dependent on friction between surfaces resulting from the surface of the expansion compensating tool being sufficiently rough "to promote friction in an amount effective to achieve common thermal expansion". None of the prior art teaches this

Both the obviousness-type double patenting rejection and the obviousness rejection rely on Sakatani or Artz to provide reference to "tooling chosen such that it achieves a common thermal expansion with the components". However, all that these references do is define the problem to be solved by the present invention. They do not point to the solution used by the present applicants, namely the use of tooling having a rough surface. As pointed out previously, Sakatani uses a plate 14 (which could be equated with the tooling of the present invention) which has the same coefficient of expansion as the composite. Selection of such a material is an alternative way to solve the problem just noted, but in no way points towards present invention of use of a rough surfaced tooling to ensure that the expansions are the same. In the case of Sakatani, such constancy of expansion is a natural consequence of the materials used and the nature of the surface of the tooling

component is irrelevant. In Artz, again the objective is to provide a tooling member whose coefficient of thermal expansion and thermal conductivity can be matched to the composite structure.

In rejecting arguments along these lines set forth previously, the examiner argues that because Sakatani and Artz achieve common thermal expansion, their surfaces must be "rough enough" to achieve this, even though the means by which they achieve common expansion has nothing to do with roughness. The amendment to claim 26 makes it clear that the surfaces of the tooling in these two cases can no longer be regarded as "rough enough" to meet the requirements of the claim because, common expansion resulting from common coefficients of thermal expansion is not covered by the claim. Sakatani and Artz therefore do not provide any missing link between the invention as now claimed and the primary references cited. No combination of any of these with Sakatani or Artz will result in a process as claimed.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John Richards
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 31053
Tel. No. (212) 708-1915